



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,815	04/26/2005	Yuichi Kubo	740107-185	8898
25570	7590	12/09/2008	EXAMINER	
ROBERTS MLOTKOWSKI SAFRAN & COLE, P.C.			MCCLELLAND, KIMBERLY KEIL	
Intellectual Property Department				
P.O. Box 10064			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgallagher@rmsclaw.com
dbeltran@rmsclaw.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,815	KUBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND	1791	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. David Safran. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 December 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: n/a.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 3,766,638 to Moore and U.S. Patent No. 4,688,540 to Ono.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments against the obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 over Moore in view of Ono. Also, a possible amendment to overcome the current rejection was presented. Examiner agrees the proposed amendment including a wafer spreader appears to overcome the current obviousness rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kimberly K McClelland/ Examiner, Art Unit 1791	/Philip C Tucker/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791
--	---